UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,037	07/13/2006	Jeffrey L. Southard	560252000800	1724
	7590 06/23/200 FOERSTER LLP	EXAMINER		
755 PAGE MIL	L RD	ROMEO, DAVID S		
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/586,037	SOUTHARD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	David S. Romeo	1647				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 i	May 2008					
· <u> </u>	is action is non-final.					
,						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list. 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) claims 1–16 (in part), 17–19 and 20(in part), drawn to a method treating heart failure comprising administering CGRP.

Group II, claim(s) 1–16 (in part) and 20 (in part), drawn to a method treating renal failure comprising administering CGRP.

Group III, claim(s) claims 21 and 22, drawn to a method of treating myocardial infarction comprising administering CGRP.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the inventions of groups I-III to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. However, the international search report filed with the present application indicates that groups I-III cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

parenterally, orally, sublingually, intranasally, intracoronary, intra-arterially, intravenously, transmucosally, intradermally, transdermally, constant rate pump, variable rate pump, programmable pump, or osmotic pump.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

claims 1 and 2 correspond to the species parenterally, orally, sublingually, intranasally, intracoronary, intra-arterially, intravenously, transmucosally, or intradermally;

claims 1 and 3 correspond to the species constant rate pump, a variable rate pump, a programmable pump, or an osmotic pump.

claims 1 and 4 correspond to the species transdermally.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1–4 and 9.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. However, the international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept.

If the species transdermally is elected, then:

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

propylene glycol, polyethylene glycol, isopropanol, oleyl alcohol, ethoxydiglycol, sodium xylene sulfonate, ethanol, oleic acid, N-methylpyrrolidone, laurocapram, alkanecarboxylic acids, dimethylsulfoxide, polar lipids, N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone, oleic acid, oleyl alcohol.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: claims 1 and 4–8 correspond to the species.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1 and 4–9.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. However, the international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

anti-proliferative agents, anti-clotting agents, vasodilators, diuretics, beta-blockers, calcium ion channel blockers, blood thinners, cardiotonics, ACE inhibitors, anti-inflammatories, and antioxidants.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: claims 1 and 10 correspond to the species.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1 and 10.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. However, the international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

alcohols, moisturizers, humectants, oils, emulsifiers, thickeners, thinners, surface active agents, fragrances, preservatives, antioxidants, vitamins, and minerals.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: claims 1 and 9 correspond to the species.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1 and 9.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. However, the international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/586,037 Page 8

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David S. Romeo whose telephone number is (571) 272-0890. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao, can be reached at (571)272-0939.

IF SUBMITTING OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE BY FAX, APPLICANTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE TO THE CENTRAL FAX NUMBER FOR OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE, WHICH IS (571) 273-8300.

CUSTOMERS ARE ALSO ADVISED TO USE CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE PROCEDURES WHEN SUBMITTING A REPLY TO A NON-FINAL OR FINAL OFFICE ACTION BY FACSIMILE (SEE 37 CFR 1.6 AND 1.8).

ANY INQUIRY OF A GENERAL NATURE OR RELATING TO THE STATUS OF THIS APPLICATION OR PROCEEDING MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE PATENT APPLICATION INFORMATION RETRIEVAL (PAIR) SYSTEM. STATUS INFORMATION FOR PUBLISHED APPLICATIONS MAY BE OBTAINED FROM EITHER PRIVATE PAIR OR PUBLIC PAIR. STATUS INFORMATION FOR UNPUBLISHED APPLICATIONS IS AVAILABLE THROUGH PRIVATE PAIR ONLY. FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE PAIR SYSTEM, SEE HTTP://PAIR-DIRECT.USPTO.GOV. CONTACT THE ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER (EBC) AT 866-217-9197 (TOLL-FREE) FOR QUESTIONS ON ACCESS TO THE PRIVATE PAIR SYSTEM,

/DAVID S ROMEO/ PRIMARY EXAMINER, ART UNIT 1647

DSR JUNE 19, 2009